

## REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims as follows. Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,202 A1 (Kosiec) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,319 B1 (Hietala).

Kosiec teaches a general transmitting/receiving apparatus and does not teach or suggest the technical construction suggested by the present invention.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 1, the Examiner states that Kosiec does not teach or suggest a controller configured to control the radio transmitted portion to operate only during a transmission burst period and to control the radio reception portion to operate only during a reception burst period, as recited in Claim 1. However, the Examiner uses Hietala to cure this deficiency. After reviewing Hietala, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

Hietala discloses a phase detector for a phase locked loop (PLL) that minimizes false locks between the phase of the divided reference frequency signal and the phase of a divided voltage controlled oscillator frequency signal (Column 6, lines 49-53). With reference to FIG. 1, Hietala teaches a transceiver having a switch 102 for switching an antenna between

transmit and receive RF (radio frequency) signal lines (111 and 113). In other words, Hietala teaches a switch for switching an antenna lead between RF transmit and RF receive lines.

However, Hietala does not teach or suggest a controller to control the radio transmitter portion to operate only during a transmission burst period and to control the radio reception portion to operate only during a reception burst period. Accordingly, as Hietala does not cure Kosiec's deficiency, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claims 2, 3, and 5, these claims include similar subject matter as contained in Claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that Claims 2, 3, and 5 are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2, 3, and 5 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1-3 and 5 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 4 and 6, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 4 and 6 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-6, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant(s)

**DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP**

333 Earle Ovington Blvd.

Uniondale, New York 11553

Tel: (516) 228-8484

Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG/ml